

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 6

August 8, 2017

143 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction, 326 C 419	3
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly determined that it was improper for trial court to dismiss sua sponte habeas petition on ground that petitioner had procedurally defaulted his claims by way of deliberate bypass, thus depriving habeas court of subject matter jurisdiction over petition; appeal dismissed on ground that certification improvidently granted.</i>	
Ferri v. Powell-Ferri, 326 C 438	22
<i>Declaratory judgment; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff trustees lacked authority to decant assets into separate spendthrift trust; whether defendant wife had standing to challenge plaintiffs' actions where defendant husband was designated as sole beneficiary; whether trial court abused its discretion in awarding attorney's fees to defendant wife; whether, in light of counterclaim alleging breach of fiduciary duty, trial court abused its discretion in declining request to remove plaintiff trustee for conflict of interest; whether trial court's judgment could be affirmed on alternative ground that trust was effectively self-settled.</i>	
Powell-Ferri v. Ferri, 326 C 457	41
<i>Dissolution; whether trial court properly determined that plaintiff did not contribute to value of trust established for benefit of defendant; claim that husband violated automatic orders imposed by rule of practice (§ 25-5) by declining to commence separate civil action against trustees for breach of fiduciary duty; whether defendant possessed chose of action against trustees amounting to intangible property interest subject to distribution; claim that structure of trial court's award of attorney's fees constituted abuse of discretion.</i>	
St. Pierre v. Plainfield, 326 C 420	4
<i>Negligence; whether municipal immunity of defendant town had been abrogated by exception under statute (§ 52-577n [a] [1] [B]) providing that municipality can be held liable for damages caused by negligence in performance of proprietary function from which it derived special corporate profit or pecuniary benefit; whether identifiable person, imminent harm exception to municipal immunity applied; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that town was immune from liability; whether town's operation of municipal pool constituted governmental function from which it derived special corporate profit or pecuniary benefit.</i>	
Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases	65

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Buehler v. Buehler, 175 CA 375	41A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; partial denial of motion for contempt; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly determined that extracurricular expenses for parties' minor children were unreasonable under facts and circumstances of case because there had been no meaningful discussion between parties prior to incurrance of those costs; whether record was inadequate to review claim when this court was provided with transcripts for only three of four days of hearing on contempt motion.</i>	
Stratford v. Hawley Enterprises, Inc., 175 CA 369.	35A
<i>Eminent domain; appeal from taking by eminent domain of real property; whether trial court improperly determined that plaintiff town was entitled to recover back taxes owed to it on parcel from condemnation award; claim that town was not entitled to recover back taxes because it failed to claim interest in condemnation</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>award in statement of compensation, as required by statute (§ 8-129 [a] [3] and [b]); whether purpose of notice provisions of § 8-129 was satisfied; whether defendant first mortgagor demonstrated that it was harmed by statement of compensation; whether it was improper for trial court to have cited foreclosure law, by analogy, for purpose of determining priority of tax lien.</i>	
Stratford v. LeBlanc, 175 CA 362	28A
<i>Foreclosure; municipal tax liens; default for failure to appear; whether trial court abused discretion in denying motions to open judgments of foreclosure by sale; whether defendant established, pursuant to statute (§ 52-212 [a]) governing opening of judgment rendered on default, that good defense existed at time judgments were rendered and that he was prevented by mistake, accident or other reasonable cause from presenting defense; whether trial court could have found that defendant did not have reasonable cause to fail to file appearances prior to defaults; reviewability of claim that good defense existed at time that judgments were rendered; whether party seeking to open default judgment must show, pursuant to § 52-212 (a), both that good defense existed and that party was prevented by mistake, accident or other reasonable cause from presenting defense.</i>	
Tilus v. Commissioner of Correction, 175 CA 336.	2A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel's joint representation of petitioner and accomplice in pretrial phase presented conflict of interest and that there was no valid waiver of potential conflict in violation of petitioner's constitutional right to conflict free representation; whether habeas court properly determined that no actual conflict of interest existed; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner failed to prove that he was prejudiced by any potential conflict created by dual representation; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner was not denied constitutional right to effective assistance of trial counsel; whether habeas court properly concluded that trial counsel's performance was deficient in that he failed to conduct timely investigation of charges against petitioner; whether petitioner was prejudiced by trial counsel's deficient performance.</i>	
Girolametti v. Michael Horton Associates, Inc. (replacement pages), 173 CA 635-38. . . .	v
Volume 175 Cumulative Table of Cases	49A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summary	1B
-------------------	----

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Amendments to the Rules of Appellate Procedure, effective October 8, 2017.	1PB
--	-----

CONNECTICUT CODE OF EVIDENCE

Revisions to the Connecticut Code of Evidence Being Considered by the Supreme Court	1C
---	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Small Claims Decentralization	2C
---	----

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
MICHAEL A. GENTILE, *Acting Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.